Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	. 09/916,232	BROWN ELLIOTT, CANDICE HELLEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jean E Lesperance	2674
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Jean E Lesperance</u> .	(3) <u>Henry Tran</u> .	ELUOT llen Brow El
(2) Stuart P. Kater.	(4) CANDICE He	llen Brow EU
Date of Interview: 12 November 2004.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)⊠ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)□ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: <u>\$7</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Maksuda</u> et al. (6,144,352)		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) 🔀 was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
·		
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	<u> </u>	ature, if required

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant's representative argued that the prior Art, matsuda, does not teach at least two blue emitters of two three colors pixel are connected to the same data driver. Examiner agrees to conduct further pearch and provides another office Action.